

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

PIN	5078	COUNTY	San Luis Obispo
APPLICANT	San Luis Obispo County FC & WCD	AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$500,000
PROJECT TITLE	San Luis IRWM Planning Grant Proposal	TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$675,000

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Develop and/or complete components of the IRWM Plan by preparing a groundwater banking plan in northern San Luis Obispo County utilizing imported water and/or local supplies, preparing an integrated regional permit plan, preparing a data enhancement plan, and preparing a flood control management plan for unfunded flood management needs.

WORK PLAN - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

Score: 9

Comment: The proposal includes a detailed work plan, budget, and schedule for the four components of the IRWMP (groundwater banking, data enhancement plan, flood management plan, and regional permitting plan); however, it is unclear how the components are to be integrated into a well coordinated IRWMP. Elements in each of the components overlap each other and would be better coordinated if the components were part of a single planning effort rather than four distinct efforts. The draft IRWMP was not provided and relevancy of the proposal could not be determined. Cost assumptions are based on the applicant doing most of the work, both the grant and match funded parts. Cost estimates for some of the work items in the budget appear to be high and are not supported by back-up documentation. The only clear deliverables are the four components of the final IRWMP which will be developed separately.

DESCRIPTION OF REGION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific description that adequately documents the region. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 4

Comment: The region is well developed and described in the proposal and is supplemented by attachments in the work plan. The applicant provides well developed arguments on why it is an appropriate area for a regional water management planning as opposed to individual planning efforts. The RWMP described in the application is the San Luis Region's Water Resource Advisory Committee (WRAC) which is a long standing committee set up by the applicant. The proposal has an adequate discussion of the biological significance of the region and environmental resources; however, the proposal did not give sufficient information on socio-economic and cultural characteristics of the region. Although the proposal identified documents that would have further expanded on those issues, they were not submitted with the application. Also, the map did not show the location of the proposed implementation projects discussed in the proposal.

OBJECTIVES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific planning objectives. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 8

Comment: The proposal has a detailed description of the immediate and long-term objectives for the IRWMP; however, the discussion is limited to a process that will determine the long-term objectives. The proposal was lacking in its discussion of how it will address statewide priorities. Most regional objectives are from an existing draft IRWMP which was not provided. This project will update four components of that IRWMP. Water conservation and recreation objectives are not fully discussed in this application, but they may be part of the four components.

INTEGRATION OF WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented how water management strategies will be integrated. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 8

Comment: This criterion was adequately addressed. The proposal identifies numerous water management strategies that are to be integrated as part of the IRWMP, but details on the mechanics of the integration were light. The applicant identifies the existence of a draft IRWMP that reportedly provides the details of the integration, but it is not part of the submittal.

IMPLEMENTATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately detailed plan implementation. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 8

Comment: Elements in the immediate objectives, such as groundwater and ecosystem restoration management, will be addressed prior to determining the long-term planning needs. Other objectives, such as water supply, water quality, and flood management, will be primarily long range objectives. The application, however, did not include a general schedule of when these components would be implemented. Implementation and monitoring of IRWMP performance will be through the existing mechanisms of the applicant (i.e. County staff and the WRAC). Due to lack of County funds, implementation for all four proposed plan components is not guaranteed.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

IMPACTS AND BENEFITS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately presented and documented the impacts and benefits of the Plan. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 10

Comment: This criterion was well documented. Impacts and benefits are generally understood based on the previous 25 years of operation of the WRAC. The specific impacts/benefits of the four components will be further analyzed during IRWMP development.

DATA AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data and technical analysis components of the proposal. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 5

Comment: This criterion was adequately addressed. Existing data will support IRWMP development and future enhancement of data collection and analyses is a component of the IRWMP to be developed.

DATA MANAGEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data management procedures. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 4

Comment: The applicant provided a detailed plan for data management; however, support of statewide data management needs is not addressed.

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented stakeholder involvement concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: The applicant states that a full description of stakeholder involvement will be in the IRWMP which is under development. Primarily, the application indicates that stakeholder involvement occurs in the WRAC. The application does not indicate how environmental justice concerns are to be addressed, nor does it detail processes for additional stakeholder identification and inclusion. Existing stakeholder involvement in water planning issues is evident. However, details of this are not in the application, but are to be submitted in July 2005 with the draft IRWMP. However, this review process does not consider information provided after the application due date.

DISADVANTAGE COMMUNITIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented disadvantaged community concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: This criterion was not adequately addressed. Although the proposal included a map on the income distribution of the county, it did not address how implementation of IRWMP will directly benefit DACs or how they will be identified and included in the planning. The applicant requests for DAC consideration are based on generalities, but no specifics were given that demonstrate the needs. The needs and impacts of water management on DACs are not discussed, but will reportedly be submitted in July 2005 with an application for an IRWM implementation grant. However, this review process does not consider information provided after the application due date. It is not possible to determine how and if the IRWMP will directly benefit the DACs, and it does not appear DACs were involved in the planning process.

RELATION TO LOCAL PLANNING - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented the Plan's relationship to local planning efforts. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 5

Comment: This criterion was adequately addressed. Local planning documents and agencies are well defined. Since the grant applicant is the local county government, the proposal is well grounded in local planning issues.

AGENCY COORDINATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented agency coordination issues. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 4

Comment: The criterion was sufficiently addressed, but it was not supported with documentation. Although agency coordination is outlined in each of the four components of the proposal, the applicant failed to demonstrate the need for an IRWMP to encompass the various components. Coordination with local agencies is well defined but coordination with specific State and federal agencies is less clear. Some key regulatory agencies are not identified by name, but will need to be involved in IRWMP development.

TOTAL SCORE: 70